

An article, ostensibly a balanced review of the smoking-health controversy, in the August edition of REDBOOK Magazine drew a variety of response from readers, some of whose letters were printed in the September issue.

REDBOOK  
September 1960

#### CIGARETTES

I have just finished reading your article about cigarettes and lung cancer in the June issue ("Cigarettes: Are the Facts Being Filtered?"). Congratulations!

The tobacco companies won't love you for it, but a lot of mothers will. . . . Some people would rather risk human life than lose a little money. I'm glad your magazine is not that kind of publication. Keep up the fight.

MRS. P. B. CORDELL  
Hesperus, Colo.

The article "Cigarettes: Are the Facts Being Filtered?" filters through only those "facts" that support one viewpoint—the position of the anti-tobacco advocates. . . .

Some of the overlooked facts are:

1) The few statistical reports that are repeatedly cited have been seriously questioned, not only for the extreme conclusions sometimes drawn from them, but also as to their validity in showing any relation of significance between smoking and health problems.

2) Numerous experiments, here and abroad, in which laboratory animals were induced to inhale tobacco smoke, frequently for their entire lives, have consistently failed to induce lung cancers attributable to the smoke.

3) Research shows that no substances or combination of substances reported to be in tobacco smoke are present in sufficient quantity to account for the claimed, limited tumor activity even on the skin of animals. Also, none of them have been shown to be cancer-causing to human beings. . . .

4) Literally hundreds of scientific studies show many factors linked to the complex chain that may result in lung cancer. . . . To select reports dealing with only one factor under study distorts the scientific effort to learn about any cancer.

5) . . . Careful scientists have reported time and again that the numerical increase in reported lung cancer deaths is due in large part to the increasing and aging of the population, improved diagnosis, and more complete case finding on the part of doctors.

. . . Many prominent research scientists and doctors do not believe the complex lung cancer problem has been, or will be, solved by the repeated pronouncements of those who campaign against tobacco.

T. V. HARTNETT, Chairman  
Tobacco Industry Research Committee  
New York, N. Y.

*All the defenses of cigarettes offered above were reported in our article.*  
THE EDITORS

As an ex-heavy smoker, I found your article to be the first truly unbiased and factual report in a national publication. Since you have never conducted a concerted campaign against smoking, the article is all the more believable. . . . True, the Tobacco Industry Research Committee has done a remarkable job of directing the attention of people away from the true facts. For this conspicuous achievement they should be either hailed or jailed (my mind is made up on that score). . . .

NORMAN GUETTLER  
Cleveland, Ohio

I think your article is an excellent summary of the present situation in which you highlight the opinions of both sides of the story. There seems to be no doubt that cigarette smoking and cancer are connected. The difficulty is to educate the public.

I think the efforts of scientists to try to find the carcinogenic agents in tobacco are a step in the right direction. If these materials can be eliminated, this would solve the problem very nicely. In the meantime, people should reduce the amount of smoking. . . .

JAMES C. HART, M.D.  
State Department of Health  
Hartford, Conn.

The Tobacco Industry Research Committee deserves better treatment at your hands. They have supported good research, attaching no strings to research money they grant. Some major foundations could learn scientific manners from them, since too often foundations dictate what problems scientists will investigate. T.I.R.C. does not. . . . I have sought T.I.R.C. support in the past and will do so in the future not in spite of but because of the fact that I am an ethical scientist.

CHARLES C. MCARTHUR, Ph.D.  
Harvard University  
Cambridge, Mass.

With controversy and propaganda surrounding the subject of smoking and lung cancer, Walter Goodman's treatment of it is balanced, objective and highly readable. I wish the article could be read by all teen-agers who are faced with the decision of whether to smoke or not, by their parents and by physicians to whom parents and children alike turn for advice. This article could well save the lives of many Americans.

HAROLD S. DIEHL, M.D.  
American Cancer Society, Inc.  
New York, N. Y.

1003543394